



THEATRE ROYAL.

WEDNESDAY next, February 27, will be presented, the Comedy of
RULE A WIFE AND HAVE A WIFE.
Adapted from Beaumont and Fletcher by the late DAVID GARRICK, Esq.
The Copper Captain, Mr. WARD;
Mr. Hallion; Don Juan, Mr. Taylor; Duke of Medina, Mr.
Banks; Sanchio, Mr. Simpson; Alonzo, Mr. Tannett; Lorenzo, Mr.
T. Banks;
And Leon, Mr. WILLIAMSON.

Mr. Gaudry; Clara, Mrs. Mountfort;
The Visiting Lady, Mrs. Charteris; 2d Visiting Lady, Mrs. Tannett;
Old Woman, Mr. Hollingsworth; Old Woman's Maid, Mr. Charteris;
And Editha, Mrs. BULKLEY.

To which will be added, a Musical Farce, called, **THE**

WATERMAN.

Tom Tugs, Mr. GAUDRY;
Bundie, Mr. CHARTERIS;
And Robin, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH;
Mrs. Bundie, Mrs. CHARTERIS;
And Wilhelmia, Miss KIRBY.

The Greatest Pennyworth at present in this City.

Woollen Drapery and Mens Mercury Goods,

Being the Whole Stock belonging to JOHN LEIGHTON, of
Luckenbooths, Edinburgh.

CONSISTING of very best Superfine Broad Cloths, Hunters Cloths,
Cassimers, Black Silk Florentine (the present fashion in London),
Vests and Breeches, Silk Shagges, Printed Velvets, White Quilting,
Silk Quilting for Vests, finest Black Velvet, Prince's Stuffs, Paisley,
Cord, Nankeen, Stockings, Handkerchiefs, &c. &c.

As the goods must all be sold off immediately, the greatest
advantage will be given, and the very best superfine broad cloths will
be sold off at 15s 6d. ready money only.

HOUSE OF LORDS, Monday, Feb. 19.

DEBATE on the Advancement of LORD GEORGE GERMAIN to

a PEERAGE.

[Concluded from our last.]

Lord Abington arose and addressed their Lordships as fol-

lows: My Lords, I am very happy to have the opportunity of

THE Noble Lord is my eye, (the Earl of Shelburne) who

is so fully informed upon every subject, and who never speaks

without giving new lights to your Lordships, having led me to

consider the subject of the original rights of this House, I rise

to state to your Lordships what my sense of this matter is.

I cannot help conceiving, that although there is not a right

of election, there is, and must be, a right of exclusion vested

in this House, when the admission of any Peer happens to be

against the sense of your Lordships; and my judgment of this

right, not only from the idea that this House is possessed of ori-

ginal rights, as independent of the Crown as of the people,

but of the circumstance of this House being the hereditary coun-

cillors of the Crown, against the sense of whom, I must hold,

that the Crown cannot of right exert itself.

It is true, that the Crown is the fountain of honour, and

that the creation of Peers is the prerogative of the Crown; but

it is so in this double sense only, that the Crown is the foun-

tain of honour, and not of disgrace; and that the creation of

Peers is the sole prerogative of the Crown, because it is nei-

ther in the Lords nor the Commons to do so; and therefore,

if a Peer can be introduced into this House but by the will of

the Crown, so of course the creation of Peers may be said to

be the sole prerogative of the Crown; but at the same time, as

every prerogative is given for the benefit of those over whom it

is to be exercised, so when the exercise of it is against the sense

of those (and when I say the sense of those, I mean the majori-

ty of this House) for whose benefit it is intended, its opera-

tion, by the very reason of the thing, must cease and deter-

mine.

Your Lordships perceive that this is a matter of speculation

only, and I wish it had continued to be so; but we are now

touched, by the business of this day, that speculation and prac-

tice are not always the cause and effects of each other, against

every thing that has been said, against common sense, against

common decency, in the face of all public virtue, and in en-

couragement of every private vice, we find a man introduced in

upon us, and, with the reward of nobility, made one of our

peers. How, my Lords, the majority of this House will feel

this, I know not; I fear, my Lords, as they have long since

felt every thing else, that they are ready to sell their birth-rights

for a mess of porridge!

For myself only I can speak, and for myself only I do assure

your Lordships, that I consider this admission of Lord George

Germaine to a Peerage, to be no less an insufferable indigni-

ty to this House, than an outrageous insult to the people at

large. It is an indignity to this House, because it is connect-

ing us with one, whom every soldier, and every soldier is a

man of honour, is forbid to associate with. It is an insult to

the people; for what has he done to merit honours superior to

this fellow citizens? I will tell your Lordships what he has

done; he has undone his country; and inasmuch has executed

the plan of that accused, invisible, though efficient Cabinet,

from whom, as he has received his orders, so he has obtained

his reward. For these reasons, my Lords, I shall as heartily

support, as I approve the worthy and noble Marquis's motion.

There is one thing I will suggest to your Lordships consid-

eration, in one word, and without any comment thereupon.

would indulge him. His Lordship was a little confused by the
peculiarity of the circumstances under which he stood, but was
cheered by the unanimous *hear him*, which came from every
quarter of the House.

He then proceeded to state to the House the nature of the
circumstances under which he had been originally convicted by
the court-martial alluded to, and the situation he had support-

ed in the civil concerns of this country since. He would not
cast any reflections upon the individual members who composed
that court, for indeed they were all now dead, one great, and
amiable character excepted, Lord Robert Manners; but in jus-

tice to himself was bound to declare, that the period under
which his trial took place was a period of faction, and that the
prejudices of party were as high or higher than they were ever

known to be at any time recorded in the history of this coun-
try. It was his fate unfortunately to become the object of the ge-
neral persecution, and the run against him was as severe, and as
indiscriminate as had ever for the time been experienced by an

individual. He would avoid entering into an examination of
the specific circumstances which constituted the subject of the
charge against him before the court-martial, but with all his heart,
and anxiously solicited their Lordships, that they would order

them before them for their deliberate investigation
and decision, and he would be content to trust his honour, and
every thing that was dear to him, in their hands. If the point
in that day's debate turned upon his competency to a seat in

that House, he would even leave the decision upon that ques-
tion to the noble Marquis who had introduced the motion, and if,
at the termination of a cool enquiry into all the circum-

stances, he pronounced against him, and would lay his hand
upon his heart and give it as his sacred opinion, that there were
just grounds of incompetency for his advancement to a Peerage,
he would relinquish all claim to the dignity, and acquiesce in

the disgrace. The King, he presumed, possessed the clear and
undoubted right of electing those he pleased to the dignity of
being members of that House, excepting only under the circum-

stance of any attested incompetency. His Majesty had been
graciously pleased to confer this honour upon him, and as he
defied any man to prove him incompetent, he could conceive
no fair source of objection to the exaltation he had experienced.

He had served his Majesty long, laboriously, and faithfully.
Many men might have excelled him in ability, but it was im-
possible for any Minister to have displayed more diligence in the
service of his country, or more fidelity to his Prince. He had

received the honour of a peerage as the spontaneous compensa-
tion for these services, and it was the highest gratification that
he could possibly have received; as it conveyed conviction in the
propriety of his conduct, from a quarter where his endeavours

were best known, and where approbation was most satisfactory.
He by no means wished, as he had before observed, to convey
the remotest reflection upon the Members of the Court-martial,
under which he had sustained the sentence repeated in the mo-

tion; but when he considered the circumstances under which
he was brought to trial, and the occurrences that had happened
to him subsequently, he could at best esteem the present motion
as altogether without any reasonable foundation for the produc-

tion of it. It was a peculiarity of his case, that he was con-
demned before he was tried; and that he was perhaps the first
and single instance in this or any other country, in which a
series of charges had been brought against an individual, and he

not permitted to speak for himself, to explain circumstances that
none but himself could be perfectly acquainted with, and which
were essentially necessary for invalidating the testimony adduced

politically or legally unfit. Under such circumstances he flattered
himself the House would perceive no good grounds for the extra-
ordinary measure of this interference between Majesty and one of
its undisputed prerogatives on the present occasion. There was

one part of the motion to which he could not help expressing
the strongest disapprobation, and that was to the order which
accompanied the sentence. — What was this order? — From
whom did it originate? It was the bare, unauthorized opinion

of a single individual, and that individual might perhaps, with-
out disrespect to him, be supposed to participate in the general
prejudice against him. Was it consistent with the justice of
that House, that the single sentiment of one particular indivi-

dual, should be adduced there to influence their opinions, and
aggravate the supposed guilt of a member? No man could be
safe, no man could flatter himself with the momentary security
of his honour or character, if an assertion from one person was

to be held in the view of legal testimony, and an undefended
effusion be considered regular proof. He hoped for their Lord-
ships candour and justice in rejecting all impression from that
part of the motion; and after observing, that the noble Mar-

quis had conducted himself with great propriety in producing
his motion in his presence, sat down with expressing his hopes
and confidence, that if circumstances should call him up again,
he might meet with their Lordships indulgence a second time.

Lord Southampton now arose, and proceeded to say, the
noble Lord who spoke last has called the Court-martial, who
sat upon his Lordship in the year 1759, a factious Court-mar-

tial; — when he got thus far, Lord Sackville arose and said,
the noble Lord had quite mistook him—he had said the times
were factious, but had cautiously guarded himself against ex-
pressing one word to the disadvantage of the Court-martial.

After this explanation, Lord Southampton, who rose merely
for the purpose of vindicating the Court-martial, sat down.

Lord Derby was of opinion, that the omission of the noble
Lord in not bringing the circumstance of the Court-martial
under a revision, was an implied acknowledgment, that he
expected nothing from that measure, and was very angry that

King George III. who issued the order that accompanied the
sentence, should have been so disrespectfully spoken of.

Lord Walsingham afterwards got up, and defended his pri-
vate official patron with great eloquence, and strength of argu-
ment. He took the matter up in a constitutional view, and
contended that there was no instance upon record, in which

that House had interposed to restrain the exercise of the royal
prerogative in the exclusive right of creating Peers. He in-
stanced the examples of Lord Bacon and Sir Robert Walpole,
who had each been convicted of civil crimes, and yet had been

subsequently called to a seat in that assembly. He dwelt upon
the instance of Sir Robert, as the more recent example, and
said, that he had been actually convicted of corruption, and had
been sentenced to the Tower as a punishment for the crime.

Yet a few years afterwards, when he was created Lord Or-
ford, no person ever thought of suggesting his previous offence
as a motive of incompetency against him, nor of interfering
with the King, to prevent the exercise of his prerogative in

creating him. — If this continued his Lordship, carried with
it no cause of incapacity for exaltation to a Peerage, how much
less ought the present case to do so? — The offence of Sir Ro-
bert Walpole was a civil offence, and might therefore have
operated as some plea for preclusion from civil preferment. The
offence imputed to his noble friend on the present occasion, was
a military one, and without, therefore, it was intended to pro-



